arXiv:1610.07077v1 [math.NT] 22 Oct 2016

THE CYCLE STRUCTURE OF A MARKOFF AUTOMORPHISM OVER FINITE FIELDS

ALOIS CERBU, ELIJAH GUNTHER, MICHAEL MAGEE, LUKE PEILEN

Abstract. The Markoff type Diophantine equation

$$x^2 + y^2 + z^2 = xyz$$

defines an affine surface with a rich nonabelian group Γ of polynomial automorphisms. For a prime p, Γ permutes the elements of $V^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$, the nonzero solutions to (1) over $\mathbb{F}_p$. We explain that it is more natural to consider the action of Γ on the quotient $W^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$ of $V^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$ by a certain normal abelian subgroup of size 4, since this allows us make a precise conjecture about the permutation group $H(p)$ generated by Γ acting on $W^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$ for each prime $p > 3$. Specifically, we conjecture that $H(p)$ is either the symmetric or alternating group on $W^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$, according to congruence properties of p.

We fix the automorphism $\vartheta \in \Gamma$ that sends $(x, y, z) \mapsto (y, z, yz - x)$ and consider for each prime p the permutation $\widehat{\vartheta}_p$ induced by ϑ on $W^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$. We introduce a heuristic that makes predictions about the infinite sequence of permutations $\{\widehat{\vartheta}_p\}$ by comparison to a sequence of permutations chosen independently and uniformly at random from a symmetric or alternating group according to our prior conjecture about $H(p)$.

The random permutation heuristic predicts that for a positive proportion of primes p the longest cycle of $\widehat{\vartheta}_p$ is $\geq p^2/8$. Numerical experiment seems to show this is unlikely to hold. Nevertheless, we can show that there is always a cycle of $\widehat{\vartheta}_p$ of size proportional to $\log(p)$. We also compute the average number of k-cycles of $\{\widehat{\vartheta}_p\}$ for some small values of k and supplement this with some numerical results. We conjecture that for prime $q > 3$ the average number of q-cycles of the family $\{\widehat{\vartheta}_p\}$ is $1/q$, which matches the prediction of the random permutation heuristic.

1. Introduction

In this paper we consider the Markoff type Diophantine equation[1]

$$x^2 + y^2 + z^2 = xyz. \tag{1}$$

For prime $p > 3$ we denote by $V^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$ the set of solutions to (1) in $(\mathbb{F}_p)^3 \setminus \{(0, 0, 0)\}$.

The affine surface cut out by (1) has a rich nonabelian group Γ of polynomial automorphisms. Given this group Γ that acts on $V^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$, it is interesting to ask about the distribution of permutations induced by the action of a fixed global automorphism on $V^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$ for varying p. This is the main question of this paper, and a question for which the Markoff equation is a fundamental example.

[1]This is a reparametrization of the Markoff equation $x^2+y^2+z^2 = 3xyz$ which appears in Markoff's theorem on Diophantine Approximation [13]. See the survey of Bombieri [3] and book of Aigner [1] for more on the Markoff equation.

To explore this question, one needs to first ask which permutations of $V^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$ can be induced by the action of Γ. In a recent paper, Bourgain, Gamburd, and Sarnak [4, Theorem 2] prove the following theorem establishing the Strong Approximation Conjecture of McCullough and Wanderley [14] for all primes outside of a small exceptional set.

Theorem 1.1 (Bourgain, Gamburd, Sarnak)**.** *Let E be the set of primes for which the action of Γ on $V^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$ is* not *transitive. For any $\epsilon > 0$, the number of primes $p \leq T$ with $p \in E$ is at most T^ϵ, for T large.*

Horowitz [9] showed that Γ is generated by Vieta involutions

$$m_1 : (x, y, z) \longmapsto (yz - x, y, z)$$

(similarly m_2, m_3), the even sign changes

$$n_1 : (x, y, z) \longmapsto (x, -y, -z)$$

(similarly n_2, n_3), and the action of S_3 on the solutions by permutations of the coordinates.

Peter Sarnak has raised the question of what permutation group is generated by the action of Γ on $V^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$. The subgroup generated by the even sign changes

$$N = \langle n_1, n_2, n_3 \rangle \trianglelefteq \Gamma$$

is normal in Γ, and isomorphic to the Klein four-group. Thus Γ cannot act 2-transitively on $V^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$ for any prime, since it must permute orbits of N. In light of this observation, we examine instead the action of Γ on the set of N-orbits in $V^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$, which we denote $W^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$.

Due to a result of Carlitz [5], $|V^*(\mathbb{F}_p)| = p(p+3)$ when $p \equiv 1 \pmod 4$ and $|V^*(\mathbb{F}_p)| = p(p-3)$ when $p \equiv 3 \pmod 4$. It is easy to verify that for p odd, each N-orbit must contain four distinct points. Thus, the set $W^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$ has size

$$|W^*(\mathbb{F}_p)| = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{4}p(p+3), & \text{if } p \equiv 1 \pmod 4 \\ \frac{1}{4}p(p-3), & \text{if } p \equiv 3 \pmod 4 \end{cases} \tag{2}$$

for each prime $p > 3$. Let $H(p)$ denote the permutation group generated by Γ acting on $W^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$. We prove the following.

Theorem 1.2. *Let $n = |W^*(\mathbb{F}_p)|$ for $p > 3$. Then, $H(p) \leq A_n$ if and only if $p \equiv 3 \pmod{16}$, where A_n is the alternating group on n elements.*

The above theorem, alongside computations of $H(p)$ for $p \leq 47$, lead us to conjecture the following:

Conjecture 1.3. Let $H(p)$ denote the permutation group induced by the action of Γ on $W^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$, and let $n = |W^*(\mathbb{F}_p)|$ for $p > 3$. Then,

- $H(p) \cong S_n$ if $p \not\equiv 3 \pmod{16}$,
- $H(p) \cong A_n$ if $p \equiv 3 \pmod{16}$.

Given Conjecture 1.3, we are now in a position to examine our main question about the distribution of permutations induced by the action of a particular global automorphism on $W^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$, for varying p.

We fix as a concrete example the following $\vartheta \in \Gamma$, the composition of a Vieta involution and permutation of coordinates

$$\vartheta : \begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \\ z \end{pmatrix} \overset{m_1}{\longmapsto} \begin{pmatrix} yz - x \\ y \\ z \end{pmatrix} \overset{(132)}{\longmapsto} \begin{pmatrix} y \\ z \\ yz - x \end{pmatrix}.$$

The element ϑ is the most basic example of a large class of automorphisms that we call *pseudo-Anosov*. The class arises as follows. The group $\mathrm{Out}(F_2)$ of outer automorphisms of the free group F_2 on two generators acts on the quotient

$$\mathcal{X} := \mathrm{Hom}(F_2, \mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{C}))/\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{C})$$

where the action of $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{C})$ on $\mathrm{Hom}(F_2, \mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{C}))$ is by conjugation. Let a, b be fixed generators of F_2. The action of $\mathrm{Out}(F_2)$ on $\mathcal{X}$ has has an invariant $\kappa : \mathcal{X} \to \mathbb{C}$ defined by

$$\kappa : \phi \mapsto \mathrm{trace}(\phi(aba^{-1}b^{-1}))$$

that arises from the fact that $\mathrm{Out}(F_2)$ preserves the set of conjugacy classes of $aba^{-1}b^{-1}$ and its inverse [6, pg. 246]. The quantity κ clearly descends to $\mathcal{X}$. By a result of Horowitz [10] the mapping

$$\mathcal{X} \to \mathbb{C}^3,\ \phi \mapsto (\mathrm{trace}(\phi(a)), \mathrm{trace}(\phi(b)), \mathrm{trace}(\phi(ab))) \tag{3}$$

is a bijection, and a further result of Horowitz [9] says that $\mathrm{Out}(F_2)$ induces the full group Γ under this bijection. The identity of Fricke and Klein [7] then gives that in coordinates $(x, y, z) \in \mathbb{C}^3$ we have

$$x^2 + y^2 + z^2 - xyz - 2 = \kappa(x, y, z), \tag{4}$$

giving the equation (1) when $\kappa = -2$.

By the Dehn-Nielsen-Baer Theorem (see [6, Theorem 8.8]) $\mathrm{Out}(F_2)$ is identified with the mapping class group[2] of a once punctured torus and is therefore subject to Thurston's classification [16] of mapping class group elements. In the current setting, an element of $\mathrm{Out}(F_2) \cong \mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$ is pseudo-Anosov if the corresponding element of $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$ has two distinct real eigenvalues. We then say an element of Γ is pseudo-Anosov if it arises from a pseudo-Anosov element of $\mathrm{Out}(F_2)$.

The element ϑ arises from the automorphism sending

$$(a, b) \mapsto (ab, a),$$

and this corresponds to the matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{Z}). \tag{5}$$

This motivates ϑ as a fundamental example.

Consider for each prime p the permutation $\widehat{\vartheta}_p \in H(p)$ induced by the action of ϑ on $W^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$. Since ϑ fixes no obvious substructure of the affine scheme cut out by (1), and a priori $\widehat{\vartheta}_p$ could be any element of the S_n or A_n from Conjecture 1.3, the following heuristic is plausible.

Random Permutation Heuristic. $\{\widehat{\vartheta}_p\}$ shares statistics with a sequence of elements chosen independently and uniformly at random from S_n or A_n (according to Conjecture 1.3).

[2]That is, the homeomorphisms fixing the puncture modulo those homeomorphisms isotopic to the identity.

The two statistics we look at to test this heuristic are the longest cycle of $\widehat{\vartheta}_p$ and the average number of k-cycles of $\widehat{\vartheta}_p$ for k fixed.

1.1. **The longest cycle.** We begin with the following fact.

Fact. Let $\sigma \in S_n$ (or A_n) be a permutation drawn uniformly at random. The probability that σ has a cycle of length at least $n/2$ in its cycle decomposition is asymptotically $\log 2$ as $n \to \infty$. This is closely related to the '100 prisoners problem' posed in [8].

The random permutation heuristic together with (2) and the previous fact suggests the following:

Hypothesis 1.4. For a positive proportion of primes p the longest cycle in the cycle decomposition of $\widehat{\vartheta}_p$ has length $\geq p^2/8$.

Remark 1.5. While in Theorem 1.1 of Bourgain, Gamburd and Sarnak the full infinite nonabelian group Γ is used, Hypothesis 1.4 would predict that for a positive proportion of primes p, close to half of $W^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$ are contained in some orbit of the cyclic group $\vartheta^{\mathbb{Z}} \leq \Gamma$.

While we were not able to establish Hypothesis 1.4, we were able to obtain the following more modest theorem.

Theorem 1.6. *There is a constant $c > 0$ such that for all primes p the permutation $\widehat{\vartheta}_p$ has a cycle of length at least*

$$\frac{\log(p)}{\log(\phi)} - c,$$

where $\phi = \frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2}$ is the golden ratio.

Remark 1.7. It is possible to prove that there is a cycle of ϑ_p of size $\gg \log\log p$ by considering the growth rate of $\vartheta^m(3,3,3)$ in $\mathbb{Z}^3$ and using that distinct elements of $\mathbb{Z}$ that project to the same element of $\mathbb{F}_p$ are distance $\geq p$ apart[3]. Theorem 1.6 gives an exponential improvement over this type of growth.

Denote by N_p the length of the longest cycle of $\widehat{\vartheta}_p$. Figure 1 plots (in blue) the pairs (p, N_p). The horizontal and vertical axes are scaled logarithmically to bring attention to the apparent power-growth of N_p. The red plot is obtained from a least-squares method linear regression of the log vs log data. The line of best fit is

$$\log N_p \approx 0.388 + 1.197 \log p,$$

and thus $N_p \approx 1.474 \cdot p^{1.197}$. This data seems to show that Hypothesis 1.4 is false. It might be the case that for very large p, the scatter plot catches up to the black line, or even some other line of slope 2, but this seems unlikely.

We obtain Theorem 1.6 from a more general theorem that covers the action of $\widehat{\vartheta}_p$ on each set of solutions in $\mathbb{F}_p$ to (4) with $\kappa \in \mathbb{F}_p$. It is an interesting problem to extend Theorem 1.6 to all pseudo-Anosov $\gamma \in \Gamma$. Since our methods use the specific structure of $\widehat{\vartheta}_p$, it was not clear to us how to do this.

[3]This argument is similar to the explicit construction by Margulis [12] of graphs of large girth relative to their number of vertices.



FIGURE 1. Plotted in blue the pairs (p, N_p), in red the line of best fit from least-squares regression of the log vs log data, and in black the graph of $y = p^2/8$. Hypothesis 1.4 predicts the scatter plot is above the black line for a positive proportion of primes.

1.2. **Average number of k cycles, k fixed.** We first make note of the following fact.

Fact. For σ chosen uniformly at random from either S_n or A_n the average number of cycles of fixed length $k < n$ in the cycle decomposition of σ is precisely $1/k$.

With this in mind, let $\pi(x)$ be the number of primes $\leq x$ and define

$$e_k(x) = \frac{1}{\pi(x)} \sum_{p \leq x} \#\{k\text{-cycles in } \widehat{\vartheta}_p\},$$

the average number of k-cycles after sampling primes up to x. The random permutation heuristic would then naively predict for each k that

$$\mathbb{E}_k := \lim_{x \to \infty} e_k(x) = 1/k. \tag{6}$$

Thus $\mathbb{E}_k$ is the average over all primes of the number of k-cycles in the cycle decomposition of $\widehat{\vartheta}_p \in H(p)$. We have the following theorem that gives the value of $\mathbb{E}_k$ for some small values of k.

Theorem 1.8. *The quantity $\mathbb{E}_k$ takes the following values:*

k	1	2	3	4	5
$\mathbb{E}_k$	0	1/2	0	1/2	1/5

The main ingredients in the proof of Theorem 1.8 beyond elementary calculations are the prime number theorem for primes in arithmetic progressions and the Frobenius density theorem for the case $k = 5$ that involves a number field with dihedral Galois group D_5.

We approximated $\mathbb{E}_k$ by computing $e_k(5807)$ for k up to 37. These values are displayed in the table below.

k	$k \cdot e_k(5807)$	k	$k \cdot e_k(5807)$	k	$k \cdot e_k(5807)$	k	$k \cdot e_k(5807)$
2	0.986	11	0.925	20	11.143	29	0.838
3	0.000	12	6.717	21	0.855	30	15.414
4	1.955	13	1.059	22	11.650	31	0.978
5	0.933	14	7.285	23	1.209	32	16.231
6	1.459	15	0.690	24	13.214	33	1.127
7	0.920	16	8.725	25	0.953	34	17.290
8	3.848	17	1.005	26	14.486	35	1.196
9	0.899	18	9.650	27	0.781	36	17.740
10	4.849	19	0.799	28	12.804	37	0.972

The random permutation heuristic and our previous remarks predict values close to 1 in the table above. Both Theorem 1.8 and our numerics show that the random permutation heuristic doesn't strictly hold; however, Theorem 1.8 and the above numerics lead us to conjecture the following.

Conjecture 1.9. For prime $q > 3$, the limit in (6) converges when $k = q$ and $\mathbb{E}_q = 1/q$.

It was pointed out to us by Doron Puder that our numerical approximations of $k \cdot e_k$ for k even seem to be close to $k/2$. This would suggest that the average number of cycles of even length is much larger than the random permutation heuristic would predict. We have no heuristic explanation of this intriguing observation at this stage, and it seems to be an interesting question for future work.

We have also learned that Meiri and Puder have obtained results towards Conjecture 1.3 that are to appear in a forthcoming work.

1.3. **Acknowledgements.** The question of what permutation group is generated by Γ on $V^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$ is due to Peter Sarnak, as well as the suggestion that something like Conjecture 1.3 could be true. We would like to thank Alex Gamburd, José Gonzalez, Sam Payne, Doron Puder and Dhruv Ranganathan for discussions about this project. We used the Sage Math libraries for Python for many of our calculations. This work was carried out during the Summer Undergraduate Math Research at Yale program.

2. The Action of Γ on the set $W^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$

2.1. **The set $W^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$.** We start this section by examining the subgroup $N = \{\mathrm{id}, n_1, n_2, n_3\}$ of Γ as it plays a special role in the action of Γ on $V^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$.

Lemma 2.1. *The subgroup N is normal in Γ.*

Proof. It suffices to check N is normalized by the generators of Γ. This is true because $m_i n_j m_i = n_j$ for $i, j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ and also because $\sigma n_i \sigma^{-1} = n_{\sigma(i)}$ for any $\sigma \in S_3$. □

As $N \trianglelefteq \Gamma$, the action of Γ on $V^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$ permutes the N-orbits of $V^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$. This imposes significant structure on the action of Γ.

Based on the Strong Approximation Conjecture [14] and the recent work of Bourgain, Gamburd, and Sarnak [4], a natural question to ask is whether the action of Γ on $V^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$ is multiply transitive.

Proposition 2.2. *Γ does not act 2-transitively on $V^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$.*

Proof. Consider $\mathbf{x} \in V^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$ and let $\mathbf{y} = n_1(\mathbf{x})$. Choose $\mathbf{x}'$ and $\mathbf{y}'$ such that for no $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ does $\mathbf{y}' = n_i(\mathbf{x}')$. This is possible as $|V^*(\mathbb{F}_p)| > 4$ by (2), so given $\mathbf{x}'$, we can always choose such a $\mathbf{y}'$. Given any $\gamma \in \Gamma$ such that $\gamma(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{x}'$, we have that for some i, $\gamma(\mathbf{y}) = \gamma n_1(\mathbf{x}) = n_i \gamma(\mathbf{x}) = n_i(\mathbf{x}')$. By our choice of $\mathbf{y}'$ this implies $\gamma(\mathbf{y}) \neq \mathbf{y}'$.

Hence no element of Γ sends $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \mapsto (\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{y}')$, so the action of Γ cannot be 2-transitive. □

Given Proposition 2.2 and the preceding remarks, it is natural to examine how Γ permutes N-orbits as opposed to points. With this in mind, we define the set $W^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$.

Definition 2.3. $W^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$ is the set of N-orbits of $V^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$.

As $N \trianglelefteq \Gamma$, the action of Γ on $V^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$ projects to an action of Γ on $W^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$. We introduce the following lemma.

Lemma 2.4. *There are no nontrivial (x, y, z) solutions to (1) with zeroes in exactly two coordinate entries.*

Proof. By symmetry, it suffices to check that we can have no solutions to (1) of the form $(0, 0, z)$, where $z \neq 0$. If $x, y = 0$, substituting into (1) we have obtain $0 + 0 + z^2 = 0$ which implies $z = 0$. □

Because of Lemma 2.4, and since $p > 2$, no points of $V^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$ are fixed by any n_i. This implies all orbits of N in $V^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$ are of size 4. Consequently, $|W^*(\mathbb{F}_p)| = \frac{1}{4}|V^*(\mathbb{F}_p)|$. This shows (2). We now investigate the finite permutation group generated by the action of Γ on $W^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$.

Definition 2.5. We define $H(p)$ as the permutation group generated by the action of Γ on the set $W^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$.

2.2. **The Permutation Group $H(p)$.** We now examine $H(p)$ with the aim of proving Theorem 1.2. We prepare the following remark for later use.

Remark 2.6. In $\mathbb{F}_p$, the number of distinct pairs of consecutive quadratic residues, both nonzero, is exactly:

$$\begin{cases} \frac{1}{4}(p-5), & \text{when } p \equiv 1 \pmod 4 \\ \frac{1}{4}(p-3), & \text{when } p \equiv 3 \pmod 4 . \end{cases} \tag{7}$$

The total number of consecutive quadratic residues is found in [2, Theorem 10-2][4]. We discount the pair $(0,1)$ in both cases, and $(-1,0)$ when $p \equiv 1 \pmod 4$, as -1 is a square exactly when this is the case.

Lemma 2.7. *For a given $i \in \{1,2,3\}$*

$$\#\{(x,y,z) \in V^*(\mathbb{F}_p) \mid m_i(x,y,z) = (x,y,z)\} = \begin{cases} p-5, & p \equiv 1 \pmod 4 \\ p-3, & p \equiv 3 \pmod 4 . \end{cases}$$

Proof. We will prove this formula for m_1, and it follows for m_2, m_3 by symmetry. We have that $m_1(x,y,z) = (x,y,z)$ exactly when

$$2x = yz. \tag{8}$$

Lemma 2.4, equation (8), and our assumption that $(x,y,z) \neq (0,0,0)$ imply that $x,y,z \neq 0$. Substituting $x = yz/2$ into (1) we have

$$y^2 + z^2 - \frac{y^2 z^2}{4} = 0. \tag{9}$$

As x is uniquely determined given y, z by (8) we count the solutions to (9) over $\mathbb{F}_p$.

Letting $Y = y^2, Z = z^2$ we have

$$Z(Y-4) = 4Y . \tag{10}$$

As $y, z \neq 0$ there are exactly as many y, z satisfying (9) as four times the number of solutions to (10).

By (10), as $Y \neq 0$, Z is determined uniquely by Y, so we just need to count possible values of $Y \neq 0$ that can satisfy (10). As Y and Z are quadratic residues, $Y-4$ must also be. Thus to count the possible solutions to (10), we just need to count the possible values of Y such that both Y and $Y-4$ are nonzero quadratic residues. This is the case if and only if $Y/4$ and $(Y-4)/4$ are consecutive nonzero quadratic residues. By (7), for $p \equiv 1 \pmod 4$ (resp. $p \equiv 3 \pmod 4$), there are $(p-5)/4$ (resp. $(p-3)/4$) of these. This gives us our result. □

Lemma 2.8. *For a given $i \in \{1,2,3\}$, the Vieta involution m_i acts as an even permutation on $W^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$ exactly when $p \equiv 3 \pmod 8$.*

Proof. We will show this result for m_1 and it follows by symmetry for m_2, m_3.

[4]Count the number of the solutions (a,b) to $a^2 - b^2 = 1$ in $\mathbb{F}_p$. To do this, count unordered pairs $\alpha := a+b,\ \beta := a-b$ such that $\alpha\beta = 1$, then discount ones that result in the same values of a^2, b^2.

Because it is an involution, the permutation induced by m_1 on $W^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$ is a product of

$$r := \frac{|W^*(\mathbb{F}_p)| - |F|}{2} \tag{11}$$

disjoint transpositions, where F is the set of fixed points of m_1 in $W^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$. As seen in the proof of Lemma 2.1, the n_i commute with m_1 so $m_1(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{x}$ exactly when for each i, $m_1 n_i(\mathbf{x}) = n_i(\mathbf{x})$. Thus $\mathbf{x}$ is fixed by m_1 if and only if all the elements of $N \cdot \mathbf{x}$ are fixed by m_1. Consequently $|F|$ is exactly one fourth the number of fixed points of m_1 in $V^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$ which we know from Lemma 2.7. We also recall from (2) the size of $W^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$. We calculate the parity of m_1 by calculating r case by case:

If $p = 4k + 1$

$$r = \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{p^2 + 3p}{4} - \frac{p-5}{4}\right) = 2(k^2 + k) + 1 \equiv 1 \pmod 2,$$

so m_1 acts as an odd permutation. If $p = 8k + 7$

$$r = \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{p^2 - 3p}{4} - \frac{p-3}{4}\right) = 8k^2 + 10k + 3 \equiv 1 \pmod 2,$$

so m_1 acts as an odd permutation. If $p = 8k + 3$

$$r = \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{p^2 - 3p}{4} - \frac{p-3}{4}\right) = 8k^2 + 2k \equiv 0 \pmod 2,$$

so m_1 acts as an even permutation. □

Proposition 2.9. *The permutation group generated by the action of $\langle m_1, m_2, m_3\rangle$ on $W^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$ is contained in the alternating group on $W^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$ if and only if $p \equiv 3 \pmod 8$.*

Proof. This follows directly from Lemma 2.8. □

In order to complete our proof of Theorem 1.2, we must check the parity of the other generators of Γ. All elements of N act trivially on $W^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$. The only remaining generators to check are those of S_3. By Proposition 2.9, we know there always will be odd permutations for $p \not\equiv 3 \pmod 8$, so we only need to examine the remaining case, when $p \equiv 3 \pmod 8$.

Lemma 2.10. *The action of S_3 on $W^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$ consists of even permutations when $p \equiv 3 \pmod{16}$. When $p \equiv 11 \pmod{16}$, it consists of both even and odd permutations.*

Proof. The group S_3 is generated by transpositions, and by symmetry they all have the same parity, so it suffices to check the parity of the action of the transposition (1 2) in the cases we consider.

Our strategy is to count the points in $V^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$ whose N-orbits are fixed by (1 2). We start by counting how many possible values x can take on, then for each of those values we will count how many points with fixed orbits there are.

The orbit of (x, y, z) is fixed if and only if

$$(x, y, z) \in \{(y, x, z), (y, -x, -z), (-y, x, -z), (-y, -x, z)\}. \tag{12}$$

Thus $x = \pm y$, so by Lemma 2.4, if $x = 0$ then $(x, y, z) = (0, 0, 0)$. Substituting the four cases of (12) into (1) we reduce to two cases:

$$2x^2 + z^2 = x^2 z, \text{ or} \tag{13}$$

$$2x^2 + z^2 = -x^2 z \ . \tag{14}$$

In both cases, the equations are quadratic in z, with discriminant $\Delta = x^2(x^2 - 8)$. Note that $\Delta \neq 0$ as $x \neq 0$ and 8 is not a quadratic residue of $\mathbb{F}_p$ because $p \equiv 3 \pmod 8$ in the cases we consider. Thus (13) and (14) have solutions over $\mathbb{F}_p$ if and only if Δ is a square, which happens if and only if $x^2 - 8$ is a square.

As $p \equiv 3 \pmod 8$ in the cases we consider there exists[5] some α such that $\alpha^2 = -8$. Setting $w := x/\alpha$ we want to count how many values w can take such that $-8(w^2 + 1)$ is a square, which we do by counting the number of nonzero consecutive quadratic residues w^2 and w^2+1. From Remark 2.6 we have that there are $(p-3)/4$ such pairs of the form $(w^2, w^2 + 1)$ where $w^2 \neq 0$ (as in both cases $p \equiv 3 \pmod 4$). Each pair of residues, $(w^2, w^2 + 1)$, can be made by both w and $-w$, which gives us $(p - 3)/2$ possible values of w and hence of x.

For each valid x, those such that Δ is a square, we have exactly four solutions total to (13) and (14) which correspond to four points which satisfy both (1) and (12) and thus four points whose N-orbits are fixed by (1 2):

$$(x, x, z_1), (x, x, z_2), (x, -x, -z_1), (x, -x, -z_2)$$

$$\text{where } z_1 = \frac{x^2 + \sqrt{\Delta}}{2},\ z_2 = \frac{x^2 - \sqrt{\Delta}}{2}.$$

Recall that as $\Delta \neq 0$, we have that $z_1 \neq z_2$, so these four points are distinct. This gives us $2(p - 3)$ points of $V^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$ in total whose N-orbits are fixed by (1 2). As each N-orbit in $V^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$ has exactly 4 points, there are $\frac{p-3}{2}$ fixed N- orbits of (1 2).

To determine the parity of (1 2), we use the same method of counting disjoint transpositions as we did for m_1 in the proof of Lemma 2.8. Letting F denotes the fixed N-orbits of (1 2), we examine the two cases:

If $p = 16k + 3$

$$\frac{|W^*(\mathbb{F}_p)| - |F|}{2} = \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{p(p-3)}{4} - \frac{p-3}{2}\right) = 2k(16k + 1) \equiv 0 \pmod 2,$$

so (1 2) acts as an even permutation. If $p = 16k + 11$

$$\frac{|W^*(\mathbb{F}_p)| - |F|}{2} = \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{p(p-3)}{4} - \frac{p-3}{2}\right) = 32k^2 + 34k + 9 \equiv 1 \pmod 2,$$

so (1 2) acts as an odd permutation. The lemma follows directly from this result. □

Theorem 1.2 now follows directly from Lemma 2.10 and Proposition 2.9.

[5]As $p \equiv 3 \pmod 4$ we have that $\left(\frac{-1}{p}\right) = -1$ and as $p \equiv 3 \pmod 8$ we have that $\left(\frac{2}{p}\right) = -1$. This implies that $\left(\frac{-2}{p}\right) = \left(\frac{-8}{p}\right) = 1$.

3. Long cycles of $\widehat{\vartheta}_p$

Let $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ be a fixed parameter and let V_k be the affine variety defined by

$$x^2 + y^2 + z^2 = xyz + k. \tag{15}$$

We consider the automorphism of this variety defined by

$$\vartheta(x, y, z) = (y, z, yz - x).$$

We consider also the finite subgroup N of even sign changes. As discussed before, ϑ acts on the orbits of N on $V_k(\mathbb{F}_p)$. We write $\widehat{\vartheta}_p$ for the induced permutation of either $W^*(\mathbb{F}_p) = N \setminus V_k(\mathbb{F}_p) - N \cdot (0,0,0)$ when $k = 0$ or of $N \setminus V_k(\mathbb{F}_p)$ when $k \neq 0$. In this section we prove the following theorem.

Theorem 3.1. *Let $|V_k(\mathbb{F}_p)|$ be the number of solutions to (15) over $\mathbb{F}_p$. There is a constant C (independent of k) such that for all p there is an cycle of $\widehat{\vartheta}_p$ of size at least*

$$\frac{\log |V_k(\mathbb{F}_p)| - \log p}{\log \phi} - C,$$

where $\phi = \frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2}$ is the golden ratio.

Theorem 1.6 is a direct consequence of Theorem 3.1 for $k = 0$ together with the bound of Carlitz [5] from the Introduction that says $|V_0(\mathbb{F}_p)| = p^2 + O(p)$.

The automorphism ϑ has the property that

$$\vartheta^n(x, y, z) = (r^{(n)}(x, y, z), r^{(n+1)}(x, y, z), r^{(n+2)}(x, y, z)) \tag{16}$$

where $r^{(n)} \in \mathbb{Z}[x, y, z]$ satisfy the nonlinear recurrence

$$r^{(n)} = r^{(n-1)} r^{(n-2)} - r^{(n-3)}, \quad n \geq 3 \tag{17}$$

with initial conditions

$$r^{(0)} = x,\ r^{(1)} = y,\ r^{(2)} = z. \tag{18}$$

We exploit this structure heavily in the proof of Theorem 3.1. Using (15) to eliminate squares of x we can write each

$$r^{(n)} = r_0^{(n)} + x r_1^{(n)} \tag{19}$$

with $r_i^{(n)} = r_i^{(n)}(k) \in \mathbb{Z}[y, z]$ depending on the parameter k. We suppress the dependence on the parameter k since we view it as fixed in this section.

In the variables $r_i^{(n)}$, $i = 0, 1$, the recurrence (17) becomes the coupled equations

$$\begin{aligned} r_0^{(n)} &= r_0^{(n-1)} r_0^{(n-2)} + (k - y^2 - z^2) r_1^{(n-1)} r_1^{(n-2)} - r_0^{(n-3)}, & (20) \\ r_1^{(n)} &= r_0^{(n-2)} r_1^{(n-1)} + r_0^{(n-1)} r_1^{(n-2)} + yz r_1^{(n-1)} r_1^{(n-2)} - r_1^{(n-3)}, & (21) \end{aligned}$$

for $n \geq 3$. The first few values after the initial conditions (18) are

$$
\begin{aligned}
(r_0^{(2)}, r_1^{(2)}) &= (z, 0) && (22)\\
(r_0^{(3)}, r_1^{(3)}) &= (yz, -1) && (23)\\
(r_0^{(4)}, r_1^{(4)}) &= (yz^2 - y, -z) && (24)\\
(r_0^{(5)}, r_1^{(5)}) &= (y^2z^3 + z^3 - 2y^2z + kz - z, -yz^2 + y) && (25)\\
(r_0^{(6)}, r_1^{(6)}) &= (y^3z^5 - 4y^3z^3 + kyz^3 - yz^3 + 3y^3z - kyz,\\
&\quad -y^2z^4 + z^4 + 3y^2z^2 + z^2 - y^2 + 1) && (26)\\
(r_0^{(7)}, r_1^{(7)}) &= (y^5z^8 - 2y^3z^8 + yz^8 - 7y^5z^6 + ky^3z^6 + 5y^3z^6 - kyz^6 + yz^6\\
&\quad +15y^5z^4 - 4ky^3z^4 + 3y^3z^4 - yz^4 - 10y^5z^2 + 4ky^3z^2\\
&\quad -4y^3z^2 + y^5 - ky^3 - y^3 + ky + y,\\
&\quad -y^4z^7 + 3y^2z^7 - z^7 + 6y^4z^5 - 6y^2z^5 - 2z^5\\
&\quad -10y^4z^3 - 2y^2z^3 - 2z^3 + 4y^4z). && (27)
\end{aligned}
$$

Let F_n be the nth Fibonacci number. Our normalization of indices is so that $F_{-1} = 0$, $F_0 = F_1 = 1$. Then for example $F_2 = 2, F_3 = 3, F_4 = 5, F_5 = 8$. Noticing a pattern in the polynomials obtained in (22)-(27), we claim the following.

Proposition 3.2. *Write*

$$r_i^{(n)} = \sum_m r_{i,m}^{(n)}(y) z^m$$

with $r_{i,m}^{(n)} \in \mathbb{Z}[y]$. Let $d_i^{(n)}$ be the largest degree of z in $r_i^{(n)}$. Then

(1) a) $d_0^{(n)} = F_{n-2}$ and b) $d_1^{(n)} = F_{n-2} - 1$.

(2) $r^{(n)}_{0,d_0^{(n)}}$ is a monic polynomial in y of degree F_{n-3} that satisfies the recursion

$$r^{(N)}_{0,d_0^{(N)}} = r^{(N-1)}_{0,d_0^{(N-1)}} r^{(N-2)}_{0,d_0^{(N-2)}} - r^{(N-1)}_{1,d_1^{(N-1)}} r^{(N-2)}_{1,d_1^{(N-2)}}, \quad N \geq 4. \tag{28}$$

(3) The degree of $r^{(n)}_{1,d_1^{(n)}}$ is $F_{n-3} - 1$ and the coefficient of $y^{F_{n-3}-1}$ is -1. Moreover $r^{(n)}_{1,d_1^{(n)}}$ satisfies the recursion

$$r^{(N)}_{1,d_1^{(N)}} = r^{(N-2)}_{0,d_0^{(N-2)}} r^{(N-1)}_{1,d_1^{(N-1)}} + r^{(N-1)}_{0,d_0^{(N-1)}} r^{(N-2)}_{1,d_1^{(N-2)}} + y r^{(N-1)}_{1,d_1^{(N-1)}} r^{(N-2)}_{1,d_1^{(N-2)}}, \quad N \geq 4. \tag{29}$$

(4) Neither $r^{(n)}_{0,d_0^{(n)}}$ nor $r^{(n)}_{1,d_1^{(n)}}$ depend on k.

Proof. We prove this by induction. Let $M \geq 4$. Suppose the claims are true when $n = M-1, M-2, M-3$ and we will prove the same for $n = M$. The base cases can be seen from (18), (22), (23).

Parts 1.a) and 2). Note from (20) that the largest degree of z contributions to $r_0^{(M)}$ are from $r_0^{(M-1)} r_0^{(M-2)} - z^2 r_1^{(M-1)} r_1^{(M-2)}$ and these contribute

$$\left(r^{(M-1)}_{0,d_0^{(M-1)}} r^{(M-2)}_{0,d_0^{(M-2)}} - r^{(M-1)}_{1,d_1^{(M-1)}} r^{(M-2)}_{1,d_1^{(M-2)}} \right) z^{F_{M-3}+F_{M-4}}$$

to $r_0^{(M)}$. This will be of the right order for *1.a)* given $F_{M-3}+F_{M-4}=F_{M-2}$ and the following. The parenthetical term above is monic in y of degree $F_{M-4}+F_{M-5}=F_{M-3}$ in y by assumptions 2 and 3 for $n=M-1,M-2$, since only $r^{(M-1)}_{0,d_0^{(M-1)}}r^{(M-2)}_{0,d_0^{(M-2)}}$ contributes to the highest degree term of y in $r^{(M)}_{0,d_0^{(M)}}$. This proves *1.a)* and *2)* for $n=M$.

Parts 1.b) and 3). This is similar to the previous argument. From (21) the largest degree of z contributions to $r_1^{(M)}$ are from $r_0^{(M-2)}r_1^{(M-1)}+r_0^{(M-1)}r_1^{(M-2)}+yzr_1^{(M-1)}r_1^{(M-2)}$ and contribute

$$\left(r^{(M-2)}_{0,d_0^{(M-2)}}r^{(M-1)}_{1,d_1^{(M-1)}}+r^{(M-1)}_{0,d_0^{(M-1)}}r^{(M-2)}_{1,d_1^{(M-2)}}+yr^{(M-1)}_{1,d_1^{(M-1)}}r^{(M-2)}_{1,d_1^{(M-2)}}\right)z^{F_{M-3}+F_{M-4}-1}$$

to $r_1^{(M)}$. This time, assuming parts 2) and 3) for $n<M$, all the terms in parentheses contribute to the leading term of $r^{(M)}_{1,d_1^{(M)}}$ and the contribution is $y^{F_{M-4}+F_{M-5}-1}(-1-1+1)=-y^{F_{M-3}-1}$. This proves *1.b)* and *3)* for $n=M$.

Part 4) follows from the recursions (28) and (29) that don't depend on k together with inspection of (18), (22), (23) for the base cases. □

The following rephrases (28) and (29) in a more useful and illuminating way.

Lemma 3.3. *Let A be the commutative ring given by*

$$A:=\mathbb{Z}[y,\epsilon]/(\epsilon^2-\epsilon y+1).$$

Let

$$R^{(M)}:=r^{(M)}_{0,d_0^{(M)}}+\epsilon r^{(M)}_{1,d_1^{(M)}}\in A.$$

Then the recursions (28) and (29) are equivalent to

$$R^{(M)}=R^{(M-1)}R^{(M-2)},\quad M\geq 4. \tag{30}$$

The initial conditions are

$$R^{(2)} = 1, \tag{31}$$
$$R^{(3)} = y-\epsilon. \tag{32}$$

Proof. This is a direct calculation. □

The equation (30) allows us to more or less solve for $R^{(M)}$. Note that if $R^{(M)}=R^{(M-1)}R^{(M-2)}$ then iterating (30) gives

$R^{(M)}=R^{(M-1)}R^{(M-2)}=(R^{(M-2)})^2R^{(M-3)}=(R^{(M-3)})^3(R^{(M-4)})^2=\ldots=(R^{(3)})^{F_{M-3}}(R^{(2)})^{F_{M-4}}$.

On using $R^{(2)}=1$ and $R^{(3)}=y-\epsilon$ from (31), (32) one obtains

Lemma 3.4. *We have*

$$R^{(M)}=(y-\epsilon)^{F_{M-3}},\quad M\geq 2.$$

Let $\eta = 2\epsilon - y \in A$, then

$$\eta^2 = y^2 - 4.$$

There is an order two automorphism of A taking $\sigma : \eta \mapsto -\eta$ and fixing $\mathbb{Z}[y]$. More intuitively, σ flips the root ϵ of the polynomial equation $\epsilon^2 - \epsilon y + 1 = 0$. Observe that $2\sigma(\epsilon) = \sigma(y) + \sigma(\eta) = y - \eta$. Define a trace

$$\mathrm{tr}(a) = a + \sigma(a) \in \mathbb{Z}[y]$$

and function I by the formula

$$I(a)\eta := a - \sigma(a).$$

Both I and tr are $\mathbb{Z}[y]$-module homomorphisms from A to $\mathbb{Z}[y]$.

Note since $2\epsilon = \eta + y$ that $2\mathrm{tr}(\epsilon) = \mathrm{tr}(\eta + y) = \mathrm{tr}(y) = 2y$ so $\mathrm{tr}(\epsilon) = y$. Also $\epsilon - \sigma(\epsilon) = \eta$ so $I(\epsilon) = 1$. Using

$$2a = (a + \sigma(a)) + (a - \sigma(a)) = \mathrm{tr}(a) + I(a)\eta$$

it follows that

$$2I(a\sigma(b)) = \mathrm{tr}(b)I(a) - \mathrm{tr}(a)I(b). \tag{33}$$

This formula will be important shortly.

Suppose[6] that $\vartheta^n(x, y, z) = (\lambda x, \mu y, \nu z)$ with (x, y, z) satisfying (15) (either over $\mathbb{Z}$ or $\mathbb{F}_p$) and $\lambda, \mu, \nu \in \{\pm 1\}$. Then by (16) $r^{(n)}(x, y, z) = x$ and $r^{(n+1)}(x, y, z) = y$. Using (19) gives

$$\begin{aligned} r_0^{(n)}(y, z) + x r_1^{(n)}(y, z) &= \lambda x, \\ r_0^{(n)}(y, z) + x r_1^{(n)}(y, z) &= \mu y, \end{aligned}$$

or rearranging,

$$\begin{pmatrix} r_0^{(n)}(y, z) & r_1^{(n)}(y, z) - \lambda \\ r_0^{(n+1)}(y, z) - \mu y & r_1^{(n+1)}(y, z) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ x \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{34}$$

Let $D_{\mu,\lambda}^{(n)}(y, z)$ be the determinant of the matrix above, that is,

$$D_{\mu,\lambda}^{(n)}(y, z) := r_0^{(n)}(y, z) r_1^{(n+1)}(y, z) - (r_0^{(n+1)}(y, z) - \mu y)(r_1^{(n)}(y, z) - \lambda) \in \mathbb{Z}[y, z].$$

Lemma 3.5. *For all $n \geq 2$, for each pair of $\mu, \lambda \in \{\pm 1\}$ the polynomial $D_{\mu,\lambda}^{(n)}$ has degree $F_n - 1$ in z and the term of highest z-degree is*

$$r_{1, d_1^{(n-1)}}^{(n-1)}(y) z^{F_n - 1}, \quad n \geq 3,$$

[6]This assumption allows us to deal with cycles of $\widehat{\vartheta}_p$ as well as ϑ_p.

$$-z, \quad n = 2.$$

In particular, $D^{(n)}_{\mu,\lambda} \neq 0$.

Remark 3.6. There is a lot of cancellation taking place in $D^{(n)}_{\mu,\lambda}$ since the leading term of say $r^{(n)}_0 r^{(n+1)}_1$ is $z^{F_{n-2}} y^{F_{n-3}} z^{F_{n-1}-1}(-y^{F_{n-2}-1}) = -z^{F_n-1} y^{F_{n-1}-1}$. On the other hand, the degree of $r^{(n-1)}_{1,d^{(n-1)}_1}(y)$ is only $F_{n-4} - 1$.

Proof. Note that $n \geq 2$ implies $F_n \geq 2$ so the lemma predicts a term with z-degree ≥ 1. Then by Proposition 3.2 there is a contribution of

$$z^{F_{n-2}+F_{n-1}-1}\left(r^{(n)}_{0,d^{(n)}_0} r^{(n+1)}_{1,d^{(n+1)}_1} - r^{(n)}_{1,d^{(n)}_1} r^{(n+1)}_{0,d^{(n+1)}_0}\right) =: z^{F_n-1} P_n(y) \tag{35}$$

to $D^{(n)}_{\mu,\lambda}$ and there are no other terms with at least as high z-degree.

We now claim that $P_n(y) = r^{(n-1)}_{1,d^{(n-1)}_1}(y)$. We calculate

$$\mathrm{tr}(R^{(M)}) = \mathrm{tr}(r^{(M)}_{0,d^{(M)}_0} + \epsilon r^{(M)}_{1,d^{(M)}_1}) = 2r^{(M)}_{0,d^{(M)}_0} + y r^{(M)}_{1,d^{(M)}_1}$$

and

$$I(R^{(M)}) = r^{(M)}_{1,d^{(M)}_1}.$$

Then using the formula (33) gives

$$\begin{aligned} 2I(R^{(n+1)}\sigma(R^{(n)})) &= \mathrm{tr}(R^{(n)})I(R^{(n+1)}) - \mathrm{tr}(R^{(n+1)})I(R^{(n)}) \\ &= \left(2r^{(n)}_{0,d^{(n)}_0} + y r^{(n)}_{1,d^{(n)}_1}\right) r^{(n+1)}_{1,d^{(n+1)}_1} - \left(2r^{(n+1)}_{0,d^{(n+1)}_0} + y r^{(n+1)}_{1,d^{(n+1)}_1}\right) r^{(n)}_{1,d^{(n)}_1} \\ &= 2P_n(y). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $P_n(y) = I(R^{(n+1)}\sigma(R^{(n)}))$.We continue to evaluate this. Using Lemma 3.4 we get

$$R^{(n+1)}\sigma(R^{(n)}) = (y-\epsilon)^{F_{n-2}}\sigma((y-\epsilon)^{F_{n-3}})$$

and $2\sigma(y-\epsilon) = 2y - 2\sigma(\epsilon) = 2y - (y-\eta) = y+\eta$. So $4(y-\epsilon)\sigma(y-\epsilon) = (2y-(y+\eta))(y+\eta) = (y-\eta)(y+\eta) = y^2 - \eta^2 = 4$. Therefore

$$(y-\epsilon)\sigma(y-\epsilon) = 1$$

and

$$R^{(n+1)}\sigma(R^{(n)}) = (y-\epsilon)^{F_{n-2}}\sigma((y-\epsilon)^{F_{n-3}}) = (y-\epsilon)^{F_{n-2}-F_{n-3}} = (y-\epsilon)^{F_{n-4}} = R^{(n-1)}$$

if $n \geq 3$. Therefore $P_n = I(R^{(n-1)}) = r^{(n-1)}_{1,d^{(n-1)}_1}$ when $n \geq 3$ as required. If $n = 2$ we get $P_n = I(y-\epsilon) = -1$. □

The following is a variant of the Schwartz-Zippel Lemma [15, 17].

Lemma 3.7. *For $n \geq 2$, for each pair $\mu, \lambda \in \{\pm 1\}$ there are at most pF_{n+1} pairs $(y, z) \in \mathbb{F}_p^2$ such that $D_{\mu,\lambda}^{(n)}(y, z) = 0$.*

Proof. Let $n \geq 3$. Using Lemma 3.5, for each value of $y \in \mathbb{F}_p$ such that $r_{1,d_1^{(n-1)}}^{(n-1)}(y) \neq 0$ there are at most $F_n - 1$ values of z such that $D_{\mu,\lambda}^{(n)}(y, z) \neq 0$. So there are at most $p(F_n - 1)$ pairs y, z with $r_{1,d_1^{(n-1)}}^{(n-1)}(y) \neq 0$ and $D_{\mu,\lambda}^{(n)}(y, z) \neq 0$. On the other hand, there are at most $F_{n-4} - 1$ values of y such that $r_{1,d_1^{(n-1)}}^{(n-1)}(y) = 0$. So there are at most $p(F_{n-4} - 1)$ pairs y, z with $r_{1,d_1^{(n-1)}}^{(n-1)}(y) = 0$ and $D_{\mu,\lambda}^{(n)}(y, z) \neq 0$. The conclusion follows from $F_n + F_{n-4} - 2 \leq F_{n+1}$ for $n \geq 3$. The case of $n = 2$ is similar. □

Lemma 3.8. *For each $n \geq 2$, there are at most $8pF_{n+1}$ triples $(x, y, z) \in \mathbb{F}_p^3$ satisfying the Markoff type equation (15) and such that*

$$\vartheta_p^n(x, y, z) \in N \cdot (x, y, z).$$

Proof. If $D_{\mu,\lambda}^{(n)}(y, z) \neq 0$ for $y, z \in \mathbb{F}_p$ then from consideration of (34) there is no $x \in \mathbb{F}_p$ such that x, y, z satisfy (15) and $\vartheta^n(x, y, z) = (\lambda x, \mu y, z')$ for any $z' \in \mathbb{F}_p$. Hence by Lemma 3.7 there are at most $4pF_{n+1}$ values of $(y, z) \in \mathbb{F}_p^2$ such that $\vartheta^n(x, y, z) = (\lambda x, \mu y, z')$ for some x, and some choice of $\lambda, \mu \in \{\pm 1\}$. Finally, from (15), given y and z in $\mathbb{F}_p$ there are at most 2 possible choices of x. □

We need to count the number of fixed points of $\widehat{\vartheta}_p$ on various V_k. The following is easy to check (see Lemma 4.1 below for the type of argument required).

Lemma 3.9. *There is one fixed point $N \cdot (2, 2, 2)$ of $\widehat{\vartheta}_p$ on $N \setminus V_4(\mathbb{F}_p)$, no fixed points of $\widehat{\vartheta}_p$ on $W^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$ and no other fixed points of $\widehat{\vartheta}_p$ on any $N \setminus V_k(\mathbb{F}_p)$ with $k \neq 0, 4$.*

We can now prove Theorem 3.1.

Proof of Theorem 3.1. Lemma 3.9 (for $n = 1$) and Lemma 3.8 (for $n > 1$) tell us that the number of $(x, y, z) \in \mathbb{F}_p$ satisfying (15) and such that $\vartheta_p^n(x, y, z) \in N \cdot (x, y, z)$ for some $1 \leq n \leq M$ is bounded by

$$1 + p \sum_{n=2}^{M} F_{n+1} \leq C_1 p \phi^M$$

where $\phi = \frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2}$ is the golden ratio. There are therefore $\leq C_2 p \phi^M$ elements of $N \setminus V_k(\mathbb{F}_p)$ that are contained in a cycle of length $\leq M$. Note that C_2 does not depend on k. Then choose M so that $C_2 p \phi^M < |V_k(\mathbb{F}_p)|$, which is implied by

$$M = \left\lfloor \frac{\log |V_k(\mathbb{F}_p)| - \log p}{\log \phi} - C_3 \right\rfloor$$

for some suitable constant C_3. With this choice, there is some element of $N \setminus V_k(\mathbb{F}_p)$ that is not contained in a cycle of length $\leq M$. □

4. Average number of k-cycles of $\widehat{\vartheta}_p$

Recall the definition of ϑ from the Introduction. For each prime p, ϑ descends to ϑ_p, a permutation of $V^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$, and $\widehat{\vartheta}_p \in H(p)$, a permutation of the set $W^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$.

4.1. **Cycles of ϑ_p.** In this section we prove a series of results about the cycles of ϑ_p. In Section 4.2 we will then translate these results to results about the cycles of $\widehat{\vartheta}_p$.

Lemma 4.1. *The permutation ϑ_p has no fixed points for all primes $p > 3$.*

Proof. Suppose $\vartheta_p(x, y, z) = (x, y, z)$, that is, $(x, y, z) = (y, z, yz - x)$. Then clearly $x = y = z$. The formula $yz - x = z$ then implies $z^2 - 2z = 0$ so $z = 0$ or $z = 2$. We exclude $(0, 0, 0)$, so $x = y = z = 2$, but this is incompatible with $x^2 + y^2 + z^2 = xyz$. □

Lemma 4.2. *For prime $p > 3$, the cycle decomposition of ϑ_p includes exactly one transposition if and only if $p \equiv 1 \pmod 3$.*

Proof. The permutation ϑ_p has exactly one transposition if and only if there are precisely two solutions to $\vartheta_p^{-1}(\mathbf{v}) = \vartheta_p(\mathbf{v})$ that solve (1), and neither is fixed by ϑ_p. This second condition is automatic by Lemma 4.1.

The point $\mathbf{v} = (x, y, z)$ is a solution to $\vartheta_p^{-1}(\mathbf{v}) = \vartheta_p(\mathbf{v})$ and (1) if and only if

$$\begin{pmatrix} y \\ z \\ yz - x \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} xy - z \\ x \\ y \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad x^2 + y^2 + z^2 = xyz. \tag{36}$$

It is straightforward to check that (36) is equivalent to

$$x(x^2 - 3x + 3) = 0, \quad y = x/(x - 1), \quad z = x. \tag{37}$$

Since $x = 0$ in (37) would imply $y = 0$ and $z = 0$, there are exactly two solutions $\mathbf{v} \in V^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$ that satisfy $\vartheta_p^{-1}(\mathbf{v}) = \vartheta_p(\mathbf{v})$ if and only if the discriminant of $x^2 - 3x + 3$ is a nonzero quadratic residue mod p. The discriminant of $x^2 - 3x + 3$ is -3. Since we assume $p > 3$, by quadratic reciprocity, -3 is a nonzero square mod p if and only if $p \equiv 1 \pmod 3$. This proves the lemma. □

Lemma 4.3. *For prime $p > 2$ the cycle decomposition of ϑ_p never contains a 3-cycle.*

Proof. If ϑ_p contains a 3-cycle then there is a point $\mathbf{v} = (x, y, z)$ on $V^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$ such that $\vartheta_p^2(\mathbf{v}) = \vartheta_p^{-1}(\mathbf{v})$ and $\vartheta_p(\mathbf{v}) \neq \mathbf{v}$. If $\vartheta_p^2(\mathbf{v}) = \vartheta_p^{-1}(\mathbf{v})$ then

$$\begin{pmatrix} z \\ yz - x \\ yz^2 - xz - y \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} xy - z \\ x \\ y. \end{pmatrix} \tag{38}$$

First note that by line 2 of (38), if $x = 0$, then $yz = 0$ and so either $y = 0$ or $z = 0$. Similarly, by line 1 of (38), if $z = 0$, then $xy = 0$, and so either $x = 0$ or $y = 0$. By Lemma 2.4, no points in $V^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$ have zeros in two coordinates, so we can assume $x \neq 0$ and $z \neq 0$.

From the first line of (38) we find $z = xy/2$. Then from the second line, $y(xy/2) = 2x$ so $y^2 = 4$ and $y = \pm 2$. Then $z = xy/2 = x(\pm 2/2)$ and so $z = \pm x$. Then (1) implies $2x^2 + 4 = 2x^2$, a contradiction when $p > 2$. □

Lemma 4.4. *For prime $p \neq 7$, the cycle decomposition of ϑ_p contains exactly one 4-cycle if and only if $p \equiv 1, 2, 4 \pmod 7$.*

Proof. The permutation ϑ_p contains exactly one 4-cycle if and only if there are precisely four solutions $\mathbf{v} = (x, y, z) \in V^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$ solving (1) and also $\vartheta_p^2(\mathbf{v}) = \vartheta_p^{-2}(\mathbf{v})$, and for which $\vartheta_p(\mathbf{v}) \neq \vartheta_p^{-1}(\mathbf{v})$ and $\vartheta_p(\mathbf{v}) \neq \mathbf{v}$ (the final requirement is met automatically by Lemma 4.1).

Claim. If $\mathbf{v} = (x, y, z) \in V^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$ belongs to a 4-cycle of ϑ then either

- **a.** $y = -1$, $x^2 - x + 2 = 0$ and $z^2 - z + 2 = 0$, or
- **b.** $y^2 - y + 2 = 0$ and $x = z = -1$.

Proof of Claim. If $\mathbf{v} = (x, y, z) \in V^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$ belongs to a 4-cycle of ϑ then

$$\vartheta_p^2(\mathbf{v}) = \begin{pmatrix} z \\ yz - x \\ yz^2 - xz - y \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} x^2y - xz - y \\ xy - z \\ x \end{pmatrix} = \vartheta_p^{-2}(\mathbf{v}), \tag{39}$$

and additionally, at least one equation in (36) from Lemma 4.2 is not satisfied.

Using the second line of (39), we obtain $z(y + 1) = x(y + 1)$. We analyze the following two cases (corresponding to the cases of the claim).

- **a.** If $y = -1$, then $x^2 + (-1)^2 + z^2 = -xz$ from (1). Thus $z^2 + 1 = -xz - x^2$. And from the first line of (39), $z = -x^2 - xz + 1$. Subtracting these equations gives $z^2 - z + 2 = 0$. Similarly, equation (1) implies $x^2 + 1 = -xz - z^2$. The third line of (39) gives $x = -z^2 - zx + 1$. Subtracting these two, we get $x^2 - x + 2 = 0$.
- **b.** If $y \neq -1$, then $x = z$. Note that the first and third lines in (39) are identical when $x = z$ and give $x + y = x^2y - x^2$, so that

  $$(x^2 - 1)y = x^2 + x. \tag{40}$$

  Note that if $x \neq -1$ in (40), then we can divide both sides by $(x + 1)$, giving $xy - y = x$, i.e. $xy - x = y$. This is a contradiction, since (36) implies $\mathbf{v}$ belongs to a transposition. So we may assume $x = z = -1$. Then (1) gives $y^2 - y + 2 = 0$. This concludes the proof of the claim.

Suppose the quadratic $t^2 - t + 2 = 0$ has 2 roots $\alpha, (1 - \alpha) \in \mathbb{F}_p$. Then $(-1, \alpha, -1)$ solves (1), and the following sequence of points constitutes a valid 4-cycle of ϑ_p:

$$\begin{pmatrix} -1 \\ \alpha \\ -1 \end{pmatrix} \longmapsto \begin{pmatrix} \alpha \\ -1 \\ 1 - \alpha \end{pmatrix} \longmapsto \begin{pmatrix} -1 \\ 1 - \alpha \\ -1 \end{pmatrix} \longmapsto \begin{pmatrix} 1 - \alpha \\ -1 \\ \alpha \end{pmatrix} \longmapsto \begin{pmatrix} -1 \\ \alpha \\ -1 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{41}$$

We conclude from our earlier claim that the points in (41) form the only possible 4-cycle of ϑ_p, and if there is no root α then there is no 4-cycle of ϑ_p. Since we assume $p \neq 7$, the quadratic $t^2 - t + 2 = 0$ has two roots if and only if its discriminant $\Delta = -7$ is a square in $\mathbb{F}_p$. By quadratic reciprocity, -7 is a square mod p if and only if $p \equiv 1, 2, 4 \pmod 7$. This proves the lemma. □

Lemma 4.5. *Let p be a prime other than $2, 7, 11, 17$. The permutation ϑ_p has exactly two 5-cycles if and only if the polynomial*

$$f(t) := t^5 + t^4 + t^2 + 3t + 1 \tag{42}$$

splits completely over $\mathbb{F}_p$.

To prove this, we first classify somewhat the fixed points of ϑ^5 on $V^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$. Write $\mathbf{x} = (x, y, z)$ and suppose $\vartheta^5(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{x}$. Then the three polynomial equations resulting from $\vartheta^3(\mathbf{x}) = \vartheta^{-2}(\mathbf{x})$ together with the Markoff equation (1) give the system of equations

$$x^2 + y^2 + z^2 - xyz = 0 \tag{43}$$

$$yz - x - x^2y + xz + y = 0 \tag{44}$$

$$yz^2 - xz - y - xy + z = 0 \tag{45}$$

$$y^2z^3 - 2xyz^2 - y^2z + x^2z + xy - z - x = 0. \tag{46}$$

Using Sage, we computed the following Gröbner basis for the ideal generated by the above polynomials to make the computation of their zero locus easier. We obtained the following equivalent system of equations:

$$x - yz - y - 2z^5 - z^4 + z^3 - 2z^2 - 5z = 0, \tag{47}$$

$$y^2 - (z^4 + z^3 + z + 2)y - (2z^5 + z^4 + 2z^2 + 5z) = 0, \tag{48}$$

$$yf(z) = 0, \tag{49}$$

$$zf(z) = 0. \tag{50}$$

This is the origin of the function f from Lemma 4.5. In light of y and z dividing the latter two equations, we aim to prove the following:

Lemma 4.6. *If $\mathbf{x} \in V^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$ with $\vartheta^5(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{x}$, none of the coordinates of $\mathbf{x}$ are zero.*

Proof. If $z = 0$, the system of equations (47)-(50) readily yield $x = y = z = 0$, a contradiction since we exclude $(0, 0, 0)$ from $V^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$. So we have shown any fixed point of ϑ^5 in $V^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$ has nonzero z coordinate. This implies the same for the y and x coordinates as follows. If $y = 0$, then the z coordinate of $\vartheta^{-1}(\mathbf{x})$ is also zero, a contradiction since $\vartheta^{-1}(\mathbf{x})$ is also fixed by ϑ^5. Similiarly, if $x = 0$, then the z coordinate of $\vartheta^{-2}(\mathbf{x})$ is also zero, another contradiction. This completes the proof. □

As a result of Lemma 4.6 and the system of equations (47)-(50), we see that $\vartheta^5(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{x}$ if and only if (47) and (48) hold together with $f(z) = 0$. Now, note that the y coordinate of $\mathbf{x}$ is the z coordinate of $\vartheta^{-1}(\mathbf{x})$, a point also fixed by ϑ^5. Therefore also $f(y) = 0$. Similarly, the x coordinate of $\mathbf{x}$ is the z coordinate of $\vartheta^{-2}(\mathbf{x})$, a point again fixed by ϑ^5, so $f(x) = 0$. We'll now show that for all but finitely many p, fixed points of ϑ^5 on $V^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$ have distinct coordinates.

Lemma 4.7. *Let $p \notin \{2, 7, 11, 17\}$. If $\mathbf{x} \in V^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$ is fixed by ϑ^5 then all three coordinates of $\mathbf{x}$ are distinct solutions of $f(t) = 0$.*

Proof. We already know x, y, z are roots of f. Let $p \neq 2$ and suppose for the sake of a contradiction that $x = y$. Then, substituting $x = y$ into (44) gives $x^3 = 2xz$ and since we

know $x \neq 0$, $x^2 = 2z$. Then putting $x^2 = 2z$ and $y = x$ into the Markoff equation (1) gives (using all of x, y, z are nonzero) $z = 4$. We also know that $f(z) = 0$ so $f(4) = 1309 = 0$ giving (since $1309 = 7 \cdot 11 \cdot 17$) $p \in \{7, 11, 17\}$, a contradiction.

Now, suppose for the sake of a contradiction that $y = z$. Then, consider $\vartheta(\mathbf{x})$, which is also fixed by ϑ^5. The x and y coordinates of this fixed point are then not distinct, a contradiction. Hence $y \neq z$.

Lastly, suppose for the sake of a contradiction that $x = z$. Then, it is easily verified that

$$\vartheta^2(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{pmatrix} x \\ xy - x \\ x^2y - x^2 - y \end{pmatrix}$$

and

$$\vartheta^{-3}(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{pmatrix} x^3y^2 - 2x^3y - xy^2 + x^3 + xy - x \\ x^2y - x^2 - y \\ xy - x \end{pmatrix}.$$

Notice that since $\vartheta^5(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{x}$, $\vartheta^2(\mathbf{x}) = \vartheta^{-3}(\mathbf{x})$ and hence $xy - x = x^2y - x^2 - y$. Now, the y and z coordinates of $\vartheta^2(\mathbf{x})$, a fixed point of ϑ^5, are equal. This is a contradiction. Hence, all three coordinates of $\mathbf{x}$ are distinct, assuming $p \notin \{2, 7, 11, 17\}$. □

With Lemma 4.7 in hand, we are now ready to prove the following.

Lemma 4.8. *Suppose the action of ϑ^5 on $V^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$ has a fixed point, $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, x_3)$ where $p \notin \{2, 7, 11, 17\}$. Then, $f(t) = t^5 + t^4 + t^2 + 3t + 1$ splits completely over $\mathbb{F}_p$ and there are exactly 10 distinct fixed points of ϑ^5, arranged as*

$$\begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \\ x_3 \end{pmatrix} \longmapsto \begin{pmatrix} x_2 \\ x_3 \\ x_4 \end{pmatrix} \longmapsto \begin{pmatrix} x_3 \\ x_4 \\ x_5 \end{pmatrix} \longmapsto \begin{pmatrix} x_4 \\ x_5 \\ x_1 \end{pmatrix} \longmapsto \begin{pmatrix} x_5 \\ x_1 \\ x_2 \end{pmatrix} \longmapsto \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \\ x_3 \end{pmatrix}$$

and

$$\begin{pmatrix} x_3 \\ x_2 \\ x_1 \end{pmatrix} \longmapsto \begin{pmatrix} x_2 \\ x_1 \\ x_5 \end{pmatrix} \longmapsto \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ x_5 \\ x_4 \end{pmatrix} \longmapsto \begin{pmatrix} x_5 \\ x_4 \\ x_3 \end{pmatrix} \longmapsto \begin{pmatrix} x_4 \\ x_3 \\ x_2 \end{pmatrix} \longmapsto \begin{pmatrix} x_3 \\ x_2 \\ x_1 \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\{x_1, ..., x_5\}$ are distinct solutions to $f(t) = 0$ in $\mathbb{F}_p$.

Proof. By Lemma 4.7, if $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, x_3)$ is a fixed point of ϑ^5 then $\{x_1, x_2, x_3\}$ are distinct nonzero solutions to $f(t) = 0$ in $\mathbb{F}_p$. Now, consider $\vartheta(\mathbf{x})$. This is also a fixed point of ϑ^5, so its coordinates must also be distinct solutions to $f(t) = 0$.

Claim 1. The z coordinate of $\vartheta(\mathbf{x})$, that we denote x_4, is distinct from x_1, x_2, x_3.

Proof of Claim 1: Suppose for the sake of a contradiction that the z coordinate of $\vartheta(\mathbf{x})$ is x_1. Then, we have the following 5-cycle of fixed points of ϑ^5:

$$\begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \\ x_3 \end{pmatrix} \longmapsto \begin{pmatrix} x_2 \\ x_3 \\ x_1 \end{pmatrix} \longmapsto \begin{pmatrix} x_3 \\ x_1 \\ x_1x_3 - x_2 \end{pmatrix} \longmapsto \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ x_1x_2 - x_3 \\ x_1 \end{pmatrix} \longmapsto \begin{pmatrix} x_1x_2 - x_3 \\ x_1 \\ x_2 \end{pmatrix} \longmapsto \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \\ x_3 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Note that the x and z coordinates of $\vartheta^3(\mathbf{x})$ are the same, which is a contradiction as $\vartheta^3(\mathbf{x})$ is fixed by ϑ^5 and using Lemma 4.7. This proves Claim 1.

Claim 2. The z coordinate of $\vartheta^2(\mathbf{x})$, that we denote by x_5, is distinct from x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4 and hence f splits completely in $\mathbb{F}_p$.

Proof of Claim 2. By applying Claim 1 with $\mathbf{x}$ replaced by $\vartheta(\mathbf{x})$ we get that x_5 is distinct from x_2, x_3, x_4. So Claim 2 holds unless $x_5 = x_1$. In that case, we would have the following 5-cycle of fixed points of ϑ^5:

$$\begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \\ x_3 \end{pmatrix} \longmapsto \begin{pmatrix} x_2 \\ x_3 \\ x_4 \end{pmatrix} \longmapsto \begin{pmatrix} x_3 \\ x_4 \\ x_1 \end{pmatrix} \longmapsto \begin{pmatrix} x_4 \\ x_1 \\ x_1x_4 - x_3 \end{pmatrix} \longmapsto \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ x_1 \\ x_2 \end{pmatrix} \longmapsto \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \\ x_3 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Note that the x and y coordinates of $\vartheta^4(\mathbf{x})$ are the same, which is a contradiction since $\vartheta^4(\mathbf{x})$ is fixed by ϑ^5. Thus, x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_5 are distinct solutions to $f(t) = 0$ in $\mathbb{F}_p$. This proves Claim 2.

Now, successively applying ϑ and ϑ^{-1} to the fixed point $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, x_3)$, we obtain the following 5-cycle of fixed points of ϑ^5:

$$\begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \\ x_3 \end{pmatrix} \longmapsto \begin{pmatrix} x_2 \\ x_3 \\ x_4 \end{pmatrix} \longmapsto \begin{pmatrix} x_3 \\ x_4 \\ x_5 \end{pmatrix} \longmapsto \begin{pmatrix} x_4 \\ x_5 \\ x_1 \end{pmatrix} \longmapsto \begin{pmatrix} x_5 \\ x_1 \\ x_2 \end{pmatrix} \longmapsto \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \\ x_3 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{51}$$

Let (1 3) denote the automorphism of $V^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$ that maps (1 3) : $(x, y, z) \mapsto (z, y, x)$. It is easy to check that

$$(1\ 3) \circ \vartheta \circ (1\ 3) = \vartheta^{-1}$$

and hence if $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, x_3)$ is fixed by ϑ^5 then so too is (1 3)$(\mathbf{x}) = (x_3, x_2, x_1)$. Given the existence of $\mathbf{x}$ and hence by the preceding arguments a cycle as in (51), we also have the following other 5-cycle of distinct fixed points of ϑ^5:

$$\begin{pmatrix} x_3 \\ x_2 \\ x_1 \end{pmatrix} \longmapsto \begin{pmatrix} x_2 \\ x_1 \\ x_5 \end{pmatrix} \longmapsto \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ x_5 \\ x_4 \end{pmatrix} \longmapsto \begin{pmatrix} x_5 \\ x_4 \\ x_3 \end{pmatrix} \longmapsto \begin{pmatrix} x_4 \\ x_3 \\ x_2 \end{pmatrix} \longmapsto \begin{pmatrix} x_3 \\ x_2 \\ x_1 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{52}$$

We checked using the Sage mathematics software libraries that the variety defined by (47), (48) and $f(z) = 0$ over the algebraic closure $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ of the rationals has exactly 10 points[7]. Therefore we can have no more than 10 points fixed by the action of ϑ^5 on $V^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$. Consequently, we have established that (for $p \notin \{2, 7, 11, 17\}$) if the action of ϑ^5 on $V^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$ has a fixed point then $f(t)$ splits over $\mathbb{F}_p$ and we have exactly 10 distinct fixed points arranged as in the statement of Lemma 4.8. □

Having proved this, we are now able to prove Lemma 4.5.

Proof of Lemma 4.5. Given Lemma 4.8, we need only show that if f splits completely in $\mathbb{F}_p$, then there exists a fixed point of ϑ^5. So suppose f splits completely in $\mathbb{F}_p$. Let z be a solution to $f(z) = 0$, and let $b = z^4 + z^3 + z + 2 \in \mathbb{F}_p$ and $c = 2z^5 + z^4 + 2z^2 + 5z \in \mathbb{F}_p$. If $q(y) = y^2 - by - c \in \mathbb{F}_p[x]$ has a root in $\mathbb{F}_p$, then we can solve (47)-(50) and hence find a fixed point of ϑ^5. So suppose for a contradiction that q has no root in $\mathbb{F}_p$.

[7]This computer calculation is exact so gives a proof that there are 10 points.

In this case, $q(y)$ is irreducible over $\mathbb{F}_p$ but splits in the extension field $\mathbb{F}_{p^2}$. In this extension, $q(y)$ has two roots. Let one of these be $y_1 \in \mathbb{F}_{p^2}$. Now, using (47)-(50), (x, y_1, z) is a solution to $\vartheta^5(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{x}$ in $\mathbb{F}_{p^2}$. Consequently, $\vartheta^{-1}((x, y_1, z))$ is as well, and thus y_1 is a solution to $f(t) = 0$. However, $f(t)$ splits over $\mathbb{F}_p$; consequently, $y_1 \in \mathbb{F}_p$, a contradiction. This completes the proof. □

4.2. **Passage from cycles of ϑ_p to cycles of $\widehat{\vartheta}_p$.** In this section we prove the following theorem that will allows us to convert the results of the previous Section 4.1 into the table of Theorem 1.8.

Theorem 4.9. *For k not a multiple of 3, there are exactly the same number of $k-$cycles of ϑ_p on $V^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$ as those of $\widehat{\vartheta}_p$ on $W^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$.*

Our strategy for proving Theorem 4.9 is to show that the set of $k-$cycles of ϑ_p in $V^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$ is in bijection with those of $\widehat{\vartheta}_p$ in $W^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$. First we consider the projection map

$$\begin{aligned} \pi : V^*(\mathbb{F}_p) &\to W^*(\mathbb{F}_p) \\ \mathbf{x} &\mapsto N \cdot \mathbf{x} \end{aligned}$$

which maps points to their N-orbits. As the action of Γ permutes orbits we have that any ϑ_p cycle in $V^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$ projects to a cycle of $\widehat{\vartheta}_p$ in $W^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$, though not necessarily one of the same size. Thus we can define $\widetilde{\pi}$ as the induced map from cycles of ϑ_p in $V^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$ to cycles of $\widehat{\vartheta}_p$ in $W^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$. Our aim is to show that $\widetilde{\pi}$ forms a bijection from k-cycles of ϑ_p in $V^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$ to k-cycles of $\widehat{\vartheta}_p$ in $W^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$. We will only consider the cases when $3 \nmid k$ as $\widetilde{\pi}$ is not a bijection and can even send k-cycles to ones of other sizes when $3|k$.

For the remainder of this section, when discussing the n_i, we extend our notation to $i \notin \{1, 2, 3\}$ by considering i modulo 3. For example, $n_4 = n_1, n_6 = n_3$. We start with a lemma central to understanding the action of ϑ on the set $W^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$.

Lemma 4.10. *As elements of Γ, $\vartheta^k n_i = n_{i-k}\vartheta^k$.*

Proof. We prove this by induction on k. When $k = 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \vartheta n_1(x, y, z) &= (-y, -z, yz - x) = n_3\vartheta(x, y, z), \\ \vartheta n_2(x, y, z) &= (y, -z, -yz + x) = n_1\vartheta(x, y, z), \\ \vartheta n_3(x, y, z) &= (-y, z, -yz + x) = n_2\vartheta(x, y, z). \end{aligned}$$

For the inductive step we use that $\vartheta^k n_i = \vartheta\vartheta^{k-1}n_i = \vartheta n_{i-(k-1)}\vartheta^{k-1} = n_{i-k}\vartheta^k$. □

It follows that for all p, $\vartheta_p^k n_i = n_{i-k}\vartheta_p^k$ and $\widehat{\vartheta}_p^k n_i = n_{i-k}\widehat{\vartheta}_p^k$. Now as we focus in on proving Theorem 4.9, we only consider the cases when k is not a multiple of 3.

To show that $\widetilde{\pi}$ is a bijection between k-cycles, we will first show it maps k-cycles to k-cycles, as a priori, this need not be the case. To do this we need a lemma.

Lemma 4.11. *Given a ϑ_p cycle in $V^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$ containing $\mathbf{w}$, there exists some $l \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for $\mathbf{v}$ in the cycle, $\mathbf{v} \in N \cdot \mathbf{w}$ if and only if $\mathbf{v} = \vartheta_p^{lm}(\mathbf{w})$ for some m.*

Proof. Consider a ϑ_p cycle containing $\mathbf{w}$ and other points of $N\cdot\mathbf{w}$. This cycle is just the orbit of $\mathbf{w}$ under powers of ϑ_p, $\langle\vartheta_p\rangle.\mathbf{w}$. Thus we claim the following that easily implies Lemma 4.11: there exists l such that

$$(\langle\vartheta\rangle\cdot\mathbf{w})\cap(N\cdot\mathbf{w})=\langle\vartheta_p^l\rangle\cdot\mathbf{w}. \tag{53}$$

By assumption, we have that for multiple $\mathbf{v}\in N\cdot\mathbf{w}$ there are $l\in\mathbb{N}, a\in\{1,2,3\}$ such that

$$\vartheta^l(\mathbf{v})=n_a(\mathbf{v}). \tag{54}$$

Out of all solutions to (54) in $\langle\vartheta_p\rangle\cdot\mathbf{w}$, we choose $\mathbf{v}\in N\cdot\mathbf{w}$ and l such that l is minimal. By construction we have that $N\cdot\mathbf{v}=N\cdot\mathbf{w}$ and $\langle\vartheta_p\rangle\cdot\mathbf{w}=\langle\vartheta_p\rangle\cdot\mathbf{v}$ which implies that $(\langle\vartheta_p\rangle\cdot\mathbf{w})\cap(N\cdot\mathbf{w})=(\langle\vartheta_p\rangle\cdot\mathbf{v})\cap(N\cdot\mathbf{v})$. Thus it suffices to show that

$$(\langle\vartheta_p\rangle\cdot\mathbf{v})\cap(N\cdot\mathbf{v})=\langle\vartheta_p^l\rangle\cdot\mathbf{v}, \tag{55}$$

as having shown (55) we would have that $w\in\langle\vartheta_p^l\rangle\cdot\mathbf{v}$ so we have that $\langle\vartheta_p^l\rangle\cdot\mathbf{w}=\langle\vartheta_p^l\rangle\cdot\mathbf{v}$. Put together, this would give us that

$$(\langle\vartheta_p\rangle\cdot\mathbf{w})\cap(N\cdot\mathbf{w})=(\langle\vartheta_p\rangle\cdot\mathbf{v})\cap(N\cdot\mathbf{v})=\langle\vartheta_p^l\rangle\cdot\mathbf{v}=\langle\vartheta_p^l\rangle\cdot\mathbf{w},$$

completing our proof.

To prove (55), we start with the "$\supseteq$" direction. Applying Lemma 4.10 to (54) repeatedly we have,

$$\vartheta^l(\mathbf{v})=n_a(\mathbf{v}),\quad \vartheta^{2l}(\mathbf{v})=n_b(\mathbf{v})\text{ or }\mathbf{v},\quad \vartheta^{3l}(\mathbf{v})=n_c(\mathbf{v})\text{ or }\mathbf{v},\quad \vartheta^{4l}(\mathbf{v})=n_d(\mathbf{v})\text{ or }\mathbf{v}, \tag{56}$$

for some $a,b,c,d\in\{1,2,3\}$. As $|N\cdot\mathbf{v}|\leq 4$, this accounts for all of $\langle\vartheta_p\rangle.\mathbf{v}\cap N\cdot\mathbf{v}$, so higher powers of ϑ_p^l just send $\mathbf{v}$ to these same points. This gives us the first direction.

To prove the "$\subseteq$" direction of (55), we assume for the sake of contradiction that we have that $\vartheta_p^{lm+r}(\mathbf{v})=n_e(\mathbf{v})$ for some $r<l,m,e$. This gives us $\vartheta_p^r(\mathbf{v})=\vartheta_p^{-lm}n_e(\mathbf{v})=n_f\vartheta_p^{-lm}(\mathbf{v})$ for some f as N is normal in Γ. By (56) we deduce that $n_f\vartheta_p^{-lm}(\mathbf{v})=n_g(\mathbf{v})$ or $\mathbf{v}$. This then implies that $\vartheta_p^r(\mathbf{v})=n_g(\mathbf{v})$ or $\mathbf{v}$. As r is less than the size of $\langle\vartheta_p\rangle.\mathbf{w}$, we can rule out the second case. As $r<l$, this now contradicts our assumption that l is minimal. □

We now use Lemma 4.11 to understand $\widetilde{\pi}$.

Lemma 4.12. *$\widetilde{\pi}$ maps k-cycles of ϑ_p to k-cycles of $\widehat{\vartheta}_p$ when $3\nmid k$.*

Proof. $\widetilde{\pi}$ clearly cannot send a k-cycle to a cycle of a larger size, so we must check that it never sends a k-cycle to one of a smaller size. This only happens if multiple points in a given k-cycle are in the same N-orbit, meaning $\widetilde{\pi}$ sends them to the same orbit in $W^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$.

Suppose for the sake of contradiction that a given k-cycle contains multiple points of $N\cdot\mathbf{w}$. Let r be the number of points in the $N\cdot\mathbf{w}$ in this cycle. Thus for the l given by Lemma 4.11, $k=rl$, implying $\vartheta_p^{rl}(\mathbf{w})=\mathbf{w}$. Note that $r\leq 4$, as an N-orbit has at most 4 points. We rule out each possible value of r one by one.

- $r = 1$. In this case $\mathbf{w}$ is the only point in its N-orbit in this k-cycle, contradicting our original assumption.
- $r = 3$. In this case, by Lemma 4.11, $\vartheta_p^{3l}(\mathbf{w}) = \mathbf{w}$ so the size of our cycle is a multiple of 3, also contradicting our assumption.
- $r = 2$. In this case we have by Lemma 4.11 that for some $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, $\vartheta_p^l(\mathbf{w}) = n_i(\mathbf{w})$ which implies $n_i\vartheta_p^l(\mathbf{w}) = \mathbf{w}$. By assumption $\mathbf{w} = \vartheta_p^l n_i(\mathbf{w}) = n_{(i-l)}\vartheta_p^l(\mathbf{w})$ which implies $n_i\vartheta_p^l(\mathbf{w}) = n_{(i-l)}\vartheta_p^l(\mathbf{w})$ which only holds if $3 \mid l$, which in turn implies the size of our cycle is a multiple of 3, also contradicting our assumption.
- $r = 4$. In this case we have by Lemma 4.11 that for some $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, $\vartheta_p^{2l}(\mathbf{w}) = n_i(\mathbf{w})$ which implies $n_i\vartheta_p^{2l}(\mathbf{w}) = \mathbf{w}$. By assumption $\mathbf{w} = \vartheta_p^{2l} n_i(\mathbf{w}) = n_{(i-2l)}\vartheta_p^{2l}(\mathbf{w})$ which implies $n_i\vartheta_p^{2l}(\mathbf{w}) = n_{(i-2l)}\vartheta_p^{2l}(\mathbf{w})$ which only holds if $3 \mid 2l$, which in turn implies the size of our cycle is a multiple of 3, also contradicting our assumption.

□

Thus we have that $\widetilde{\pi}$ sends k-cycles of ϑ_p to k-cycles of $\widehat{\vartheta}_p$ and now must establish that it is a bijection of k-cycles. To do this, we introduce another lemma.

Lemma 4.13. *Given $\mathbf{x} \in V^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$, $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}, k$ not a multiple of 3, we have that $\vartheta_p^k(\mathbf{x}) = n_i(\mathbf{x})$ if and only if $\vartheta_p^k n_{i-k}(\mathbf{x}) = n_{i-k}(\mathbf{x})$.*

Proof. First, as $3 \nmid k$, n_i, n_{i+k}, n_{i-k} are distinct non-identity elements of Γ. Because $N \cong V_4$, this implies $n_i = n_{i+k}n_{i-k}$. Next, applying this fact and Lemma 4.10 we have that

$$n_{i-k}(\mathbf{x}) = \vartheta^k n_{i-k}(\mathbf{x}) = n_{i-2k}\vartheta^k(\mathbf{x}) = n_{i+k}\vartheta^k(\mathbf{x}) \iff x = n_{i+k}n_{i-k}\vartheta^k(\mathbf{x}) = n_i(\mathbf{x}).$$

□

Now we are ready to finish proving Theorem 4.9.

Proof of Theorem 4.9. From Lemma 4.12, we know that $\widetilde{\pi}$ sends k-cycles to k-cycles. We now will show it is a bijection.

To check surjectivity, we must rule out the possibility that there is a $\widehat{\vartheta}_p$ cycle of length k in $W^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$ that is not the image of a ϑ_p cycle of length k in $V^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$ under $\widetilde{\pi}$. For there to be a point whose N-orbit is fixed by ϑ_p^k but is not fixed by ϑ_p^k itself, we have that $\vartheta_p^k(\mathbf{x}) = n_i(\mathbf{x})$ for some $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. As a consequence of Lemma 4.13 we have that $\vartheta_p^k n_{i-k}(\mathbf{x}) = n_{i-k}(\mathbf{x})$. Thus this cycle in $W^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$ is the image under $\widetilde{\pi}$ of one in $V^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$ containing $n_{i-k}(\mathbf{x})$.

To check injectivity, we must rule out the possibility that multiple ϑ_p cycles in $V^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$ are in the same N-orbits as each other, so project to a single $\widehat{\vartheta}_p$ cycle in $W^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$. It suffices to show that if $\vartheta^k(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{x}$ we never have that $\vartheta^k n_i(\mathbf{x}) = n_i(\mathbf{x})$ for any i. Suppose $\vartheta^k n_i(\mathbf{x}) = n_i(\mathbf{x})$ for some i, we can choose j such that $n_i = n_{j-k}$. By applying Lemma 4.13 this gives us that $\vartheta_p^k(\mathbf{x}) = n_j(\mathbf{x})$, a contradiction, so injectivity follows. □

Lemma 4.14. *$\widehat{\vartheta}_p^3$ has no fixed points in $W^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$.*

Proof. If $\mathbf{x}' \in W(\mathbb{F}_p)$ is a fixed orbit of $\widehat{\vartheta}_p^3$, then for some element $\mathbf{x} \in \pi^{-1}(r')$ we have that $\mathbf{x}$ is fixed by ϑ^3 or $\vartheta^3(\mathbf{x}) = n_i(\mathbf{x})$ for some i. The first possibility is ruled out by Lemma 4.3. The second reduces to one of three cases, where $\mathbf{x} = (x, y, x)$:

- $\vartheta^2(\mathbf{x}) = n_1\vartheta^{-1}(\mathbf{x})$. This implies $yz = 0$ and $xy = 2z$ so $z = 0$ or $y = 0$, Either way, we have that at least two of the coordinates are 0. By Lemma 2.4, we have that $\mathbf{x}' = (0, 0, 0)$.
- $\vartheta^2(\mathbf{x}) = n_2\vartheta^{-1}(\mathbf{x})$. This implies $xz = 0$ and $yz = 2x$ so $z = 0$ or $x = 0$, Either way, we have that at least two of the coordinates are 0. By Lemma 2.4, we have that $\mathbf{x}' = (0, 0, 0)$.
- $\vartheta^2(\mathbf{x}) = n_3\vartheta^{-1}(\mathbf{x})$. This implies $xy = 2z, yz = 2x, yz^2 = zx$. If $z = 0$, $\mathbf{x} = (0, 0, 0)$. Otherwise, $x = 0$ which also implies $\mathbf{x} = (0, 0, 0)$.

Thus the only point of $W(\mathbb{F}_p)$ fixed by $\widehat{\vartheta}_p^3$ is $(0, 0, 0)$, so no points of $W^*(\mathbb{F}_p)$ are fixed. □

4.3. **Proof of Theorem 1.8.** Lemma 4.1 tells us that there are never any fixed points of ϑ_p. Then by Theorem 4.9 there are never any fixed points of $\widehat{\vartheta}_p$. This gives the first entry $k = 1$ of the table in Theorem 1.8.

Lemmas 4.2 and 4.4 tell us that there is exactly one 2-cycle or 4-cycle of ϑ_p exactly when p satisfies certain congruences modulo 3 or 7 respectively. By Theorem 4.9, there are the same number of cycles of $\widehat{\vartheta}_p$ under the same congruence conditions. The density of primes for which these congruences hold is $1/2$ in both cases by the prime number theorem for arithmetic progressions. Therefore the average number of 2 and 4-cycles of $\widehat{\vartheta}_p$ is $1/2$ in both cases of $k = 2$ and $k = 4$, completing these entries of the table of Theorem 1.8.

Lemma 4.14 gives that $\widehat{\vartheta}_p$ has no 3-cycles, hence the $k = 3$ entry of the table in Theorem 1.8.

Lemma 4.5 in combination with Theorem 4.9 tells us that outside a finite set of primes, there are exactly two 5-cycles of $\widehat{\vartheta}_p$ exactly when a certain degree 5 monic polynomial $f \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ splits completely over $\mathbb{F}_p$. We calculated the Galois group of f and found it to be the dihedral group D_5 of order 10. Therefore by Frobenius's density theorem [11, Theorem 5.2], the density of primes for which f splits completely is $1/10$. Hence the average number of 5-cycles of $\widehat{\vartheta}_p$ is $2 \cdot \frac{1}{10} = \frac{1}{5}$ which is the last value ($k = 5$) needed to complete the proof of Theorem 1.8.

References

[1] M. Aigner. *Markov's theorem and 100 years of the uniqueness conjecture*. Springer, Cham, 2013. A mathematical journey from irrational numbers to perfect matchings.

[2] G. E. Andrews. *Number theory*. Dover Publications, Inc., New York, 1994. Corrected reprint of the 1971 original [Dover, New York; MR0309838 (46 #8943)].

[3] E. Bombieri. Continued fractions and the Markoff tree. *Expo. Math.*, 25(3):187–213, 2007.

[4] J. Bourgain, A. Gamburd, and P. Sarnak. Markoff Surfaces and Strong Approximation: 1. *arXiv:1607.01530*, July 2016.

[5] L. Carlitz. The number of solutions of some special equations in a finite field. *Pacific Journal of Mathematics*, 4:207–217, 1954.

[6] B. Farb and D. Margalit. *A primer on mapping class groups*, volume 49 of *Princeton Mathematical Series*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2012.
[7] R. Fricke and F. Klein. *Vorlesungen über die Theorie der Automorphen Functionen*. 1897.
[8] A. Gál and P. B. Miltersen. The cell probe complexity of succinct data structures. *Theoretical computer science*, 379(3):405–417, 2007.
[9] R. Horowitz. Induced automorphisms on Fricke characters of free groups. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 208:41–50, 1975.
[10] R. D. Horowitz. Characters of free groups represented in the two-dimensional special linear group. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 25:635–649, 1972.
[11] G. J. Janusz. *Algebraic number fields*, volume 7 of *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, second edition, 1996.
[12] G. A. Margulis. Explicit constructions of graphs without short cycles and low density codes. *Combinatorica*, 2(1):71–78, 1982.
[13] A. Markoff. Sur les formes quadratiques binaires indéfinies. *Mathematische Annalen*, 15:381–406, 1880.
[14] D. McCullough and M. Wanderley. Nielsen equivalence of generating pairs of $\mathrm{SL}(2, q)$. *Glasg. Math. J.*, 55(3):481–509, 2013.
[15] J. T. Schwartz. Fast probabilistic algorithms for verification of polynomial identities. *J. Assoc. Comput. Mach.*, 27(4):701–717, 1980.
[16] W. P. Thurston. On the geometry and dynamics of diffeomorphisms of surfaces. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.)*, 19(2):417–431, 1988.
[17] R. Zippel. Probabilistic algorithms for sparse polynomials. In *Symbolic and algebraic computation (EUROSAM '79, Internat. Sympos., Marseille, 1979)*, volume 72 of *Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci.*, pages 216–226. Springer, Berlin-New York, 1979.